

**From:** Mahaffie, Lynn  
**Sent:** 15 Aug 2017 21:29:27 +0000  
**To:** Bounds, Herman;Daggett, Elizabeth;Hong, Jennifer  
**Cc:** McLarnon, Gail  
**Subject:** RE: thoughts on ACICS

Yes, this is confirmation for a May meeting. I also spoke with Kathleen about moving ACCJC to Dec of 2018, and we are both fine with that. Happy to discuss more if desired.

---

**From:** Bounds, Herman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2017 9:05 AM  
**To:** Daggett, Elizabeth; Mahaffie, Lynn; Hong, Jennifer  
**Cc:** McLarnon, Gail  
**Subject:** RE: thoughts on ACICS

Should we consider this confirmation for a May meeting? If so, as Beth stated, we will need direction from above to move ACCJC. Herman

Herman Bounds Jr., Ed.S  
Director  
Accreditation Group  
Office of Post Secondary Education  
US Department of Education  
400 Maryland Ave  
Washington DC 20202  
[Herman.Bounds@ed.gov](mailto:Herman.Bounds@ed.gov)<<mailto:Herman.Bounds@ed.gov>>  
202-453-7615

---

**From:** Daggett, Elizabeth  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2017 8:57 AM  
**To:** Mahaffie, Lynn; Hong, Jennifer  
**Cc:** McLarnon, Gail; Bounds, Herman  
**Subject:** RE: thoughts on ACICS

Thanks for the update, Lynn. And, thank you for remembering that we will need direction from above in our scheduling in order to make this happen.

Elizabeth Daggett  
Tel: (202) 453-6190

---

**From:** Mahaffie, Lynn  
**Sent:** Monday, August 14, 2017 4:38 PM  
**To:** Hong, Jennifer  
**Cc:** McLarnon, Gail; Bounds, Herman; Daggett, Elizabeth  
**Subject:** RE: thoughts on ACICS

Yes, that is correct.

---

**From:** Hong, Jennifer  
**Sent:** Monday, August 14, 2017 4:38 PM  
**To:** Mahaffie, Lynn  
**Cc:** McLarnon, Gail; Bounds, Herman; Daggett, Elizabeth  
**Subject:** Re: thoughts on ACICS

So, to be sure, the May meeting would replace a June 18 meeting to include all agencies slated for the June 18 meeting moved up to May and adding ACICS?

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 14, 2017, at 3:30 PM, Mahaffie, Lynn <[Lynn.Mahaffie@ed.gov](mailto:Lynn.Mahaffie@ed.gov)> wrote:

<image002.gif>

Please see below regarding the date for the spring NACIQI meeting. I am sorry that I did not share this earlier (I was on leave). I hope that Kathleen shared this with you.

Beth – we can talk about your workload. I know that we need to make adjustments!

---

**From:** Eitel, Robert  
**Sent:** Friday, August 04, 2017 6:51 PM  
**To:** Mahaffie, Lynn; Manning, James; Smith, Kathleen  
**Subject:** RE: thoughts on ACICS

Lynn:  
ACICS is interested in this model (file by October 1 with a May hearing). I have looped back with Kathleen on it.  
Thanks,  
Bob

---

**From:** Mahaffie, Lynn  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 26, 2017 10:52 AM  
**To:** Eitel, Robert; Manning, James; Smith, Kathleen  
**Subject:** thoughts on ACICS

Bob, Jim, and Kathleen – This morning, Herman, Beth, Gail, and I did some brainstorming about how the Department could review and make a determination on an initial petition from ACICS before the June 13<sup>th</sup> date by which institutions formerly accredited by ACICS would need a new accreditor. We came up with the following potential solution:

We could move the June NACIQI meeting up to May 21-23, 2018 which would provide sufficient time for the SDO to make a decision before June 13<sup>th</sup>. This would be a difficult (compressed) timeline for both the AG group and the SDO, but it is doable. It would also provide additional time for ACICS to complete its petition. We would need to get ACICS' petition at least 6 months before the committee meeting. If ACICS can submit its petition by October 1<sup>st</sup>, we might not need to move anything off the June agenda. If the petition comes in later, there are agencies that could be delayed until December of 18 without affecting institutional eligibility for Title IV aid.

It is not feasible for us to delay the December 17 meeting to February 18 without implications for multiple agencies that have already been delayed once. We would need to work with OGC to determine if those agencies could maintain their gatekeeping status, but it is questionable. Also, such a delay would not resolve our workload issues, and there are no agencies that can be pulled off the December 17<sup>th</sup> agenda.

I am happy to answer any questions or provide further explanation if desired. -- Lynn